

## **REMARKS**

Claims 17-22, 38, 39, 41-47, and 51-56 are pending. Claims 48 and 49 are canceled. Claims 54 and 55 are new.

Claims 17, 47, and 51 are amended per Examiner suggestion (Final Office Action, page 2, second paragraph) to overcome the current grounds of rejection.

Claim 47 has also be amended to recite “defined charge” to be consistent.

Support for new claim 54 may be found at least at page 10, lines 25 to 27.

Support for new claim 55 may be found at least at page 12, line 6-10 and page 16, line 17-22.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability for claims 38, 39, 41-46, and 53. Applicants added new claims 54 and 55. These new claims are believed also allowable because they depend from allowable claim 53.

## **ART REJECTIONS**

### **Claims 17 and 51**

Claims 17-21, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sweetser. Claims 22, 49, 51, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable. Regarding claims 17 and 51, the Examiner in the Office Action suggested a claim amendment to overcome the current grounds of rejection. Applicants have amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 17, 51, and their dependent claims are believed allowable. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

### **Claim 47**

The Examiner disagreed with the applicants as to claim 47. The Examiner asserts that the claim is “written broadly and does not define the specifics of “a defined voltage” and merely claims “a defined voltage”. (Office Action, page 3, last paragraph) The recitation of “defined voltage” has been replaced by “defined charge” for consistency.

Additionally, applicants have amended claim 47 in the same manner as suggested by the Examiner for claims 17 and 51. As amended, claim 47 recites “means for determining if the pixel is partially corrupted or completely corrupted, wherein the determination of partial or

complete corruption is based at least partially on the amount of deviation between the output voltage and an expected value that is modified by the defined charge.” Applicants believe that this amendment puts the claim in condition for allowance for the same reasons claims 1 and 17 are allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above remarks, the rejections to the independent claims are believed overcome for at least the reasons noted above. Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable in their present form. Please feel free to contact the undersigned at the number provided below if there are any questions, concerns, or remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Cindy H. Shu/

Cindy H. Shu  
Reg. No. 48,721

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100